

Application Serial No.: 10/036,079
Amendment and Response to October 18, 2006 Final Office Action

REMARKS

Claims 20 – 26 are in the application. Claims 1 – 19 are canceled and 20 – 26 are currently amended previously presented. Claims 20 and 24 are the independent claims herein.

No new matter is added to the application as a result of this Amendments and Response. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 20 – 26 were rejected as being unpatentable over Burge, US 6,014,638 (hereinafter, Burg) in view of "Thin client: back to the future"; Jeff Richardson; InTech; Sep 2001 (hereafter, Thin). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's comments in the Final Office Action, "Response to Arguments" section dated October 18, 2006 are appreciated by Applicant. In reply thereto, Applicant currently amends claims 20 – 26 to clarify that the claimed computing device and method relate to a client computing device. Thus, it should be clear that it is the claimed client computing device that stores browser software adapted to control the processor of the client computing device to download and display information from a plurality of network sites, characteristic information associated with each of a plurality of network sites, preference information including a ranking of preferred ones of the plurality of network sites as measured by the characteristic information for automatically configuring user preferences indicated by the browser software, and instructions adapted to be executed by the processor of the client computing device. Further, claim 20 recites the processor of the client computing device executes instructions to, inter alia, update the ranking of preferred ones of the plurality of network sites based on the updated characteristic information to automatically reconfigure user preferences for the user associated with the client computing device as indicated by the browser software.

Application Serial No.: 10/036,079
Amendment and Response to October 18, 2008 Final Office Action

Claim 24 relates to a method that is, in relevant part, similar to claim 20. For example, claim 24 recites, inter alia, a method for operating a client computing device to allow a user to interact with network sites over a network interface, including automatically configuring the browser software using a set of preference information stored at the client computing device, the preference information including a ranking of preferred ones of the plurality of network sites, the ranking previously established based on characteristic information stored at the client computing device and automatically measured based on previous network activity of the user, operating the browser software to interact with a plurality of network sites, updating the a ranking of preferred ones of the plurality of network sites based on the updated characteristic information to automatically reconfigure user preferences indicated by the browser software.

Moreover, it is clear that the claimed browser software of the client computing device is adapted to control the processor to update the ranking of the preferred ones of the plurality of network sites visited by the client computing device. Applicant currently amends claims 20 and 24 to clarify that ranking of the preferred ones of the plurality of network sites is updated.

Burge was cited and relied upon in the Office Action to disclose all aspects of claims 20 and 24 except for a computing device with instructions stored at the computing device. For storage of instructions with a computing device, the Office Action cites and relies upon the Thin reference. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Burge and Thin do not disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited and relied upon Burge discloses, "[T]he functions of data collection and display customization are performed automatically by the electronic shopping system." (emphasis added) (See Burge, Abstract) Also, Burge states that, "[H]ost computers, with which subscribers to the on-line service communicate, run application programs providing specialized services such as preferred embodiment of the present invention configured as a shopping manager 84. Specifically, the electronic shopping manager sends display information to the shopper's computer 80. Information about the shopper's selection is communicated

Application Serial No.: 10/036,079
Amendment and Response to October 18, 2006 Final Office Action

back to the electronic shopping manager so additional display information may forwarded to the shopper's computer" and "the Browse/Purchase process of the electronic shopping manager processes the user selection data 12 to develop preference profile data as the user navigates through the shopping environment." (emphasis added) (See Burge, col. 4, ln. 40 – 47; and col. 6, ln. 51 – 55)

Furthermore, Burge states,

The present invention is a sophisticated computer system and method for analyzing a computer user's past navigational history to determine needs and preferences so that subsequent computer displays may be customized in accordance with the user's needs and preferences. The processes of determining content and content presentation are separated so that the layout of the computer displays is completed independently of content selection[.] Using this approach, content may change frequently without affecting determination of the layout. In an alternative embodiment, the processes of determining content and presentation of content may be combined. (See Burge, col. 3, ln. 1 – 12)

Thus, it is clear that the cited and relied upon Burge provides a mechanism for providing a customized display based on display preferences of a shopper.

Accordingly, Burge does not deliver the same results for the end user, as alleged in the Office Action. Instead, Burge monitors display preferences for a shopper based on a navigation history of the shopper to provide a customized display to the shopper. However, Applicant claims a client computing device having a storage device coupled to the processor of the client computing device and storing browser software adapted to control the processor... to download and display information from the plurality of network sites,...preference information including a ranking of preferred ones of the plurality of network sites, and instructions adapted to be executed by the processor to, inter alia, update the ranking of the preferred ones of the plurality of network sites. That is, Burge discloses a host system that monitors display preferences for a shopper and customizes a display based on the display preferences, whereas Applicant claims a client computing device having a processor to update a ranking of preferred ones of a plurality of network sites.

Application Serial No.: 10/036,079
Amendment and Response to October 18, 2006 Final Office Action

Applicant further submits that the cited and relied upon Thin reference fails to correct the insufficiencies of Burge. That is, the combination of Burge and Thin fails to render claim 20 obvious under 35 USC 103(a). Even if the teachings of a thin client as disclosed in the Thin reference were combined with Burge as alleged in the Office Action, claim 20 would be patentable over the Burge/Thin combination since Burge fails to disclose that for which it is cited and relied upon for disclosing.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is patentable over the combination of Burge and Thin for at least the reasons discussed above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is patentable over the cited and relied upon Burge and Thin under 35 USC 103(a).

Claims 21 – 24 were rejected on the same basis as claim 20. Claims 21 and 23 depend from claim 20 and claims 25 – 26 depend from claim 24. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21, 23 and 25 – 26 are patentable over Burge and Thin for at last depending on allowable claims 20 and 24.

Application Serial No.: 10/036,079
Amendment and Response to October 18, 2006 Final Office Action

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-5985.

Respectfully submitted,

December 18, 2006
Date



Randolph P. Calhoun
Registration No. 45,371
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-5985